



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

H. B. M. This Congress seems to be destined to create a further reaching, more extraordinary, stronger league than has ever been formed in the world. The Holy Alliance will be less powerful than this confederation should England be willing to be a party as a constituent member. Mankind will bless a thousand times such league for the public weal, and America as well as Great Britain will reap its benefits.

The relations of political communities would obtain a code of public law for their universal rule of conduct.

1. The New World would be formed by independent nations bound together by a common set of laws which would fix their foreign relations and would give them a conservative power in a general and permanent Congress.

2. The existence of these new States would obtain new guarantees.

3. Spain would make peace through respect for England and the Holy Alliance would recognize these new rising nations.

4. Internal order would be preserved untouched, both among and within each of the different States.

5. No one would be weaker than the other, no one the stronger.

6. A perfect balance would be established in this true new order of things.

7. The strength of all would come to the aid of the one suffering from a foreign enemy, or anarchial factions.

8. Difference of origin and color would lose their influence and power.

9. America would have nothing more to fear from that awful monster which has devoured the Island of San Domingo, nor would there be any fear of the preponderance in numbers of the primitive inhabitants.

10. Social reform, in short, would have been attained under the blessed auspices of liberty and peace—but England should necessarily take in her hands the beam of the scales.

Great Britain would undoubtedly attain considerable advantages through this arrangement.

1. Her influence in Europe would progressively increase and her decisions will be like those of destiny.

2. America would serve her as a wealthy commercial domain.

3. America would be to her the center of her relations between Asia and Europe.

4. English subjects would be considered equal to the citizens of America.

5. The mutual relations between the two countries in time would become the same.

6. British characteristics and customs would be taken by Americans as standards of their future life.

7. In the advance of the centuries, there would be, perhaps, one single nation covering the world—the federal nation.

These ideas are in the mind of some Americans of the most prominent class; they are awaiting impatiently the initiation of this project in the Panama Congress, which may be the occasion of consolidating the union of the new States with the British Empire.

BOLIVAR.

AFTER THE WAR

THE only prophecy in which the ADVOCATE OF PEACE has allowed itself freely to indulge of late is the prophecy that wars, as means of settling international disputes, will eventually cease. Yet now enough facts have been clearly revealed by the war upon us to warrant other rather definite conclusions as to the immediate future.

Many theories acceptable to and enforced by States, especially during the last one hundred years, are now demonstrably false. For example, nations are no longer independent entities, they can never be again. Stupendous vanities, exaggerated egotisms, hypocrisy, lust for power, absolutism, fears of democracy and of international revolutions, these are all subversive of life, liberty, happiness, because they are subversive of that peace which is the first essential condition for the establishment of justice. Secret alliances and ententes cannot promote any practical "balance of power." Governments resting only upon force rest only upon dynamite. There are evidences now that Bernhardtism, be it German, American, or English, has been forever disproved, even in the high places. As recently set forth in the *Vorwaerts*, published daily, when not suspended by the military bureaucracy, in Berlin:

"No matter whether Germany or Great Britain wins, neither will have gained anything at all comparable with its losses. Only the United States, which has remained out of the conflict, will reap any of the commercial benefits."

The non-combatant nations are the only real winners as a result of this war, if, indeed, any nation can be said to be in fact a winner because of it. Even the chancelleries now grant the supreme evil of war. Efforts directed today toward the abolition of war constitute the supreme interest of the world. The maintenance of peace is and must be the goal of statesmanship.

The huge armaments thought to be so necessary for the maintenance of international peace are at last condemned as causes and not prevention of wars. Some method of reducing armaments was at the foundation of The Hague Conference in 1889. It is now more than ever a problem for practical politics. The objection to militarism is stronger today than ever, at least in the thought of the peoples.

Whether the world is to return to the *status quo* of early July, 1914, or not cannot now be seen. The problem of reimbursing Belgium is still unsolvable. We cannot forecast the fate of Germany's former possessions in Africa and the Pacific. Alsace-Lorraine are in the balance; and the same is true of Tyrol, Carnia, Trentino. The whole Balkan situation is darker than ever, and uncertainty hovers over Poland, Galicia, Bukowina. Whether the war is to be ended by endurance or adjust-

ment cannot be said. No man knows what the morrow may bring forth, but the day after tomorrow is clear. Sir Edward Grey's pathetic words on July 30, 1914, "some more definite *rapprochement* between the powers than has been possible hitherto," fell upon deaf ears. But today international organization is beckoned by the imploring hands of a world upon its knees.

After the present war there is to be such an organization of the nations and on a basis newer and more hopeful than anything heretofore thought to be possible. The war is refurbishing anew the structures of democracy. Law and order between nations is now seen to be the most important of the world's unsolved problems.

Out of this war humanity is to be reborn. Human beings will see in a newer and brighter light the great everlasting principles of life, liberty, property, happiness, out of which develop all of man's enduring satisfactions.

A PEACE PLAN FROM AUSTRIA

A *word to the peace societies and peace friends of all countries* is the title of a German pamphlet by Dr. Leo Elsner, of Vienna. The pamphlet is of value not merely as a suggestion of the terms of peace which Dr. Elsner thinks would be acceptable and permanent, but also as a glimpse into the Austro-German attitude toward some of the principles considered basic by many of the peace workers in this country. The pamphlet reviews briefly the high points in the progress of the idea of world organization from Peter Dubois in 1305 to the second Hague Conference, the general conclusion being that so far the specific aims of the peace workers either to reduce armaments or to abolish wars are scarcely nearer to realization than of old.

Dr. Elsner's solution of the problem lies in what he calls a "Guarantee Treaty" for the union of all or nearly all the states represented in the second Hague Conference, the possessions and dependencies of each signatory power to be assured for all time, and the possibility of acquiring territory from another state by force to be excluded, the "*status quo*" being guaranteed by the whole body of signatory states.

It is pointed out that if such a guarantee is to be efficient the treaty must provide for the extension of The Hague tribunal, which shall watch "vital interests," be an international court of inquiry, regard violation of treaties, condemn guilty parties to fines and indemnities, and act as a sort of international Executive Committee which shall, if necessary, proceed by methods of compulsion, either economic boycott or military force. By extending this organization it would be possible to promote the economic interests of the states by neutralizing waterways, allowing cessions of outlets to the sea, and

the like. The acquisition of territory would be allowed only by cession or purchase with the consent of the other signatories, but never by conquest.

Dr. Elsner sees little hope for any democratic international government; indeed, he considers our attempts thus far at international organization to be absurd as well as impracticable. The realization of a World State would mean to rewrite national constitutions long established, constitutions which could not, even if desirable, be remodeled within any reasonable time. The modern admixture of races in border provinces, coupled with the opportunity for bribery and corruption in any case of a popular vote, makes any attempt to accomplish "the consent of the people of a ceded province" practically impossible, and, indeed, a farce. It is unthinkable to Dr. Elsner that in case two governments should agree to transfer a given territory any great state would submit to the check and absurdity of a popular vote. In such a case there are but two things to be considered, namely, military advantage and political expediency.

He repeatedly lays great stress upon the fact that the moment for launching such a Guarantee Treaty is the time when the treaty of peace is being drawn up at the close of the present conflict. He urges the peace societies of the world to gain the ears of their several governments that they may signify a readiness for such a "guarantee of possessions." He would not have us understand that the plan must be accomplished in the peace treaty which shall close the present war; but that it must be perfected in the peace conference of the nations which will inevitably follow.

Pointing out that this plan should not be side-tracked by questions such as disarmament, he states that previous steps toward universal peace have no more reached their end than a wagon which has come to the hither side of a swollen stream over which there is no bridge. The Guarantee Treaty which he proposes seems to him the bridge. In short, he would substitute a Concert of Powers for the "Balance of Powers."

If neutral states were to be included in such a treaty, as they ought to be, they must stand for some such proposal as the Guarantee Treaty, and that before the territories now in dispute are disposed of. In other words, the work should be begun at once, because at no other time can it be so well done. Indeed, the pamphlet urges Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and the Netherlands to make official declarations immediately, and particularly to unite with the American countries for the promotion of these proposals. Only if this is done, the writer thinks, can there be any hope that further wars may be prevented.

The index of volume 77 of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* is ready for distribution and will be sent upon request.